

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated November 19, 2009, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.

**I. Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claimed process must be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or transforms a particular article to a different state or thing.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 4, 15 and 19 as indicated above, as discussed with the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant believes that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection should be withdrawn.

**II. Rejection of claims 1-12 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill et al. (US 2002/009574 A1), and in further view of Panico (US 2003/062536 A1), and further in view of Chase (US 2005/0098627 A1).

**Claim 1**

The Examiner asserts that Cahill teaches the following elements of claim 1:

“storing respective **camping pad attribute information** for camping pads of a camping facility..

obtaining reservation request information concerning the **camping facility** and the given **camping vehicle**; and providing an indication of one or more candidate **camping pads** based on the respective **camping pad attribute** information of the **camping pads of the camping facility** and the **camping vehicle attributes for the given camping vehicle...**"

The Examiner concedes that Cahill does not teach "storing camping vehicle attribute information for a given camping vehicle" and cites Panico to cure the deficiency.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Chase teaches "wherein the camping pad attribute information includes information regarding the location and availability of at least one of water and sewer connections on the camping pad," as recited in claim 1.

An exemplary method consistent with claim 1 involves reserving camping pads by storing information about both respective pads and camping vehicles, receiving (obtaining) reservation information regarding a camping facility and a particular vehicle, and identifying candidate camping pads based on the stored information and the attributes of the particular vehicle. Further, in the exemplary method one type of information stored and taken into consideration when a pad is matched to a particular vehicle includes the location and availability of either water or sewer line connections on the camping pad. More specifically, in the exemplary method consistent with this claim, the location and availability of water or sewer connections on the camping pad are taken into consideration when matching a particular camping pad to a particular camping vehicle.

In rejecting this claim, the Examiner asserts that the combination of Cahill and Panico teaches facilitating the reservation of a camping facility by taking into account vehicle attributes. However, the Examiner acknowledges that neither Cahill nor Panico teach camping pad attribute information including information regarding the location and availability of at least one of water

and sewer connections. Instead, the Examiner asserts that Chase cures this deficiency.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has misconstrued the applied references.

Both Panico and Cahill are directed to systems for discovering, reserving and transferring parking spaces and provide no teachings regarding using the systems for reserving camping pads. This would be apparent to one of skill in the art in light of the Applicant's specification. Further, one of skill in the art would know that a parking space is not the same as a camping pad. Specifically, merely because one is capable of locating a space for parking their vehicle does not teach or suggest camping on such a site since reserving camping pads is fundamentally different from reserving parking spaces.

Specifically, camping pads are, by definition, designed to be camped upon and thus provides facilities to allow a user to set up a camping vehicle and live therein, with many of the amenities of a house, for a period of time. Conversely, as would be apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art, parking spaces are designed to allow the storage of a vehicle while a user is elsewhere. Thus, systems designed for allocating and reserving parking spaces do not take into consideration unique factors associated with camping pads, nor is there any motivation to modify a system directed to parking spaces, to take these factors into consideration.

Cahill and Panico do not teach taking into consideration the unique factors associated with camping vehicles and camping pads, when identifying candidate camping pads for a specified vehicle. Therefore, it would not be obvious to modify Cahill and Panico to include the teachings of Chase.

Further, Applicant also submits that as Cahill and Panico are directed to parking spaces, which are used to store vehicles while the user is elsewhere, there is no motivation to modify Cahill and Panico as suggested by the Examiner because information regarding the location and

availability of water or sewer connection is irrelevant to parking a vehicle as described in Cahill and Panico. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not modify the systems of Cahill and Panico to take into consideration the location and availability of sewer or water connections as asserted by the Examiner because this information is not a factor used in identifying and reserving parking spaces.

The Examiner asserts that paragraphs [0040] and [0044] of Cahill teach storing camping pad attribute information and obtained reservation request information concerning the camping facility and the given camping vehicle. However, the aspect of Cahill cited by the Examiner describes that dimensions of a vehicle is an attribute which is taken into account when reserving a parking space. For example, the size such as a car, truck, trailer or shipping container is taken into account. However, at no point does Cahill describe camping pad attribute information, a camping facility or a camping vehicle.

Therefore, assuming Chase teaches “wherein the camping pad attribute information includes information regarding the location and availability of at least one of water and sewer connections on the camping pad,” it would not be obvious to combine chase with Cahill since Cahill is not concerned with camping as described in Chase. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion in Cahill to take into account water and sewer connections on a camping pad.

Further, claim 15, lines 5-7 of Panico describes that a mobile user unit comprises a memory for storing vehicle attribute information for a parking space detection and transfer system. Again, there is no teaching or suggestion that such information is for a camping vehicle.

In summary, Cahill and Panico at best describe systems for assigning and transferring parking spaces, which are designed to store a vehicle when a user is elsewhere. Conversely, the present claims are directed to a system of reserving camping pads, which are designed for a

person to be able to live on with a camping vehicle. Thus, the systems of Cahill, Panico and Chase fail to take into consideration the unique features required for camping pad reservation systems as claimed.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 and all claims dependant thereon, are patentable over the applied references.

Further, to the extent that claims 4 and 15 recite features similar to those discussed above, Applicant would also submit that claims 4 and 15 and all claims dependant thereon are patentable for analogous reasons.

## **Claim 2**

Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein the camping vehicle attribute information comprises one or more of:  
tip-out portion particulars,  
wherein the tip-out portion particulars includes information on location and dimensions of the tip-out portions;  
location of connections for hook-ups on the camping vehicle;  
and tolerance for slopes.

The Examiner states that Cahill does not teach the elements of claim 2, and cites Panico paragraph [0026] to cure the deficiency. The Examiner reasons that vehicle attributes include vehicle geometry which is used to match parking space request for parking space offers.

Therefore, as indicated by the Examiner, the vehicle geometry of Panico is used to find a parking space. The information of Panico is not used to make a camping facility reservation, consequently, there is no need for storing camping vehicle attribute information. Further, Panico

at most discloses that geometry information, such as length and width of a vehicle, is taken into account. There is no teaching or suggestion that tip-out portion information, location of connections for hook-ups on the camping vehicle, or tolerance for slopes, is taken into account.

Therefore, claim 2 should further be deemed allowable.

### **Claim 3**

Claim 3 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein the camping pad attribute information comprises one or more of:

- power pedestal particulars;
- pad access attributes;
- pad foliage;
- pad composition;
- pad distance from camping facility features; and
- availability of communications features including one or more of telephone, CATV, and network connections.

The Examiner asserts that Cahill paragraph [0004] and paragraph [0041] teaches this aspect of the claim. The aspects of Cahill cited by the Examiner describe that attributes for a requesting party include a larger space for a larger sized vehicle or an end space for unloading cargo. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of a camping pad, let alone camping pad attribute information.

For at least the above reasons, claim 3 should further be deemed allowable.

### **III. Rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill in view of Panico, further in view of Chase and further in view of Inokuchi (USP 2004/0080510). Claim

13 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 4 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Inokuchi does not cure the deficiencies of Cahill, Panico and Chase.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 19, 2010

---

Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361